APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,756	09/12/2003	Ranapratap Lavu	RAYTL1700	8147

39602   7590   02/12/2008
NOBLITT & GILMORE, LLC.
4800 NORTH SCOTTSDALE ROAD
SUITE 6000
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251

EXAMINER
LUX, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4127	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/12/03*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is a First Action Non-Final on the merits. Claims 1-28, as originally

filed, are currently pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-3, 7-11, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Abrahams (2005/0086090) in view of Beverina (2001/0027389).

As per claim 1, Abrahams teaches a method of managing risk related to a successful

completion of a development project, comprising:

storing a probability of occurrence (Pf) table (via Table 1, that shows an example of

different risk probabilities, Table 1, p. 4) and a severity of consequence (Cf) table (via Table 2,

that shows an example of different risk consequences, Table 2, p. 4), identified risks and existing

risk mitigation plans in a shared risk database (Fig. 1C shows a template for an identified risk,

and control [mitigation] plans, said information must inherently be stored within a database); and

viewing the Pf table to select a probability of occurrence Pf for said at least one

risk; (via Table 1, that shows an example of different risk probabilities, Table 1, p. 4)

viewing the Cf table to select a severity of consequence Cf for said at least one

risk, (via Table 2, that shows an example of different risk consequences, Table 2, p. 4) said Pf

and Cf being combined and ranked to define prioritized risk factor Rf (a user selects inherent

values of likelihood [Pf] and consequence for a risk [Cf}, and … the system then calculations

residual levels of likelihood, consequence and risk rating for the risk [Pf], ¶ 6, lines 6-11),

     However, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose

     via a web browser, a plurality of users,

          formulating an enterprise search of the risk database to identify at least one risk,

          formulating a mitigation search of the risk database to identify existing risk

mitigation plans for the identified risk to enhance the development of new mitigation plans or

share with other programs the resources to implement the mitigation plan.

     Beverina in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems] teaches a web browser

(Fig. 3), a plurality of users (Fig. 1), formulating an enterprise search of the risk database to

identify at least one risk (via ¶ 361, "the user can also search the sites for particular information"

where the particular information is a risk, and formulating a mitigation search of the risk

database to identify existing risk mitigation plans for the identified risk to enhance the

development of new mitigation plans or share with other programs the resources to implement

the mitigation plan. (via "risk mitigation [that] also uses threat and countermeasure

characteristics in making decisions. Various countermeasures are compared to the specific threat

to determine which ones are most effective at mitigating the risk of the threat against the target",

Examiner construes this to be the equivalent of a mitigation plan search as it evaluates existing

plans to provide the user with the best alternatives. ¶ 307, lines 9-13)

     It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine

the risk management system taught by Abrahams with the risk management system features of

Beverina. Motivation for the combination is a system with more features that should produce

better risk management analysis and techniques.

As per claim 2, Abrahams teaches the method wherein the probability of occurrence table

has a plurality of risk categories, each said category having table entries that include

standardized qualitative probability definitions. (via Table 1, p. 4, that shows the plurality of

categories ranging from rare to almost certain, and the standardized qualitative probability

definitions for each category of risk)

As per claim 3, Abrahams discloses the method further comprising tailoring the

probability of occurrence table to the select few categories that are relevant to the development

project. (¶ 6, lines 7-8 teach that a user can select inherent values of likelihood and consequence

for a risk [this data coming from Table 1 on p. 4]). However, Abrahams fails to explicitly

disclose that this is done via a web browser. Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk

management systems], teaches a browser based risk management system. It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the system taught by

Abrahams in a web based environment as taught by Beverina. Motivation to combine the two is

present as a web based risk management system allows users in remote locations to easily

modify and update risk profiles.

As per claim 7, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose the method wherein the enterprise

search includes a combination of at least two parameters including current or historic, risk factor,

vendor, component, functional area, category, key work in risk title, key work in risk description,

IPT, actionee, actionee/team, lead/submitter, or risk number. However, Beverina, in the same

field of endeavor [risk management systems], teaches searches "by categories such as threat

type, risk, score and others" (¶ 363, lines 3-5). Examiner construes risk to be the current risk factor, and threat type to be the category. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the risk management system taught by Abrahams with the risk management system search features of Beverina. Motivation for the combination is a system where users have easier access to past records, and therefore can use past results easier.

As per claim 8, Abrahams teaches at least one risk including a combination of risk number, program, risk title and a current risk factor (Fig. 1B displays the risk number next to the risk, and a program is detailed under each consequence [Examiner construes a program to be a series of steps, in this case the program is the corrective controls], Fig. 1C displays the title, as well as the risk rating). However, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose that this information is retrieved via a search. Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems], teaches searches "by categories such as threat type, risk, score and others" (¶ 363, lines 3-5). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the risk management system taught by Abrahams with the risk management system search features of Beverina. Motivation for the combination is a system where users have easier access to past records, and therefore can use past results easier.

As per claim 9, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose the method wherein the web browser provides a transfer link from said at least one risk with its risk mitigation plan to import the selected risk and mitigation plan into another program. However, Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems], teaches that "Results from local VAT 200 sessions are transferred to the TIMS 130, in the form of the VAT Database 220, and stored in a database along with sessions from other sites." (¶ 364) Fig. 1 further illustrates this detail as risk

mitigation plans are created and stored, until they are imported into the TIMS program. It would
have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the risk
management system taught by Abrahams with the risk management system features of Beverina.
Motivation for the combination is a system with more features that should produce better risk
management analysis and techniques.

As per claim 10, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose the method wherein the mitigation
search includes a combination of at least two parameters including a risk description, risk status,
start date, original planned complete date, planned complete date, and complete date. However,
Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems], teaches that users can
"search and browse the data from the individual VAT 200 sessions by categories such as threat
type, risk, score and others." (¶ 363) Figure 50 shows a calendar within that VAT 200 for entry
of start and completion dates. A user therefore, would be able to do a mitigation search
including the parameters of start date and complete date. It would have been obvious to one
skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the risk management system taught by
Abrahams with the risk management system features of Beverina. Motivation for the
combination is a system with more features that should produce better risk management analysis
and techniques.

As per claim 11, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose the method further including
automatically generating risk reports including identified risks, prioritized risk factors, and
mitigation plans. However, Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems],
teaches that users can "create, edit and delete report formats to create new and customized
reports to meet future needs" (¶ 374, lines 6-7). A user would be enabled to create risk reports

including the identified risk, prioritized risk factors, and mitigation plans. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the risk management system taught by Abrahams with the risk management reporting feature of Beverina. Motivation for the combination is a system with more features that should produce better risk management analysis and techniques as well as easier sharing of information.

As per claim 13, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose the method wherein the web browser has an interface that includes a menu bar with pull-down menu items and menu sub-items for viewing the current program, conducting the enterprise search and conducting the mitigation search and hyperlinks to the Pf and Cf tables. However, Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems] teaches a web browser (Fig. 3), with pull-down menu items [viewable in the drawing] and menu sub-items for viewing the current program [viewable in the drawing], conducting the enterprise search [via the search box] and conducting the mitigation search [via the search box] and hyperlinks to the Pf and Cf tables [via the THREATS and VULNERABILITY hyperlinks in the drawing]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the risk management system taught by Abrahams with the web based feature of Beverina. Motivation for the combination is a system with more features that should produce better risk management analysis and techniques as well as easier navigation of information.

As per claim 14, Abrahams teaches the method wherein the identified risks, risk factors, and mitigation plans for each user are stored in the shared risk database. Figure 1B shows the "knowledge base" construed by Examiner to be a database, containing identified risks, risk

factors, and mitigation plans [Examiner construes the corrective control and the preventative control to be a mitigation plan].

4.   Claims 4-6, 12, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrahams (2005/0086090) and Beverina (2001/0027389) in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

        As per claim 4, the combination of Abrahams and Beverina teaches the claimed invention as mentioned in claim 1, above. Abrahams further teaches the method wherein the severity of consequence table has a schedule impact category with the table entries having a cost impact category with the table entries specifying multiple sub-categories of cost impacts in actual dollars for the development project. (Table 2, p. 4) However, the Abrahams and Beverina combination fails to explicitly disclose table entries specifying an amount in days, weeks or months. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of project management to measure negative impacts upon projects like delays in units of time such as days, weeks, or months. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the table taught by Abrahams and Beverina with Examiner's Official Notice. Motivation to combine is to have an additional quantifiable way to measure consequences of a particular outcome.

        As per claim 5, Abrahams teaches the method wherein said multiple sub-categories include development cost (NRE), unit cost (DTC) and operations and support (O/S) categories. (via "in one mode of use, the inherent risk impact cost is aggregated over the inherent cost of each consequence of the risk" where consequences of each risk would inherently include development cost, unit cost, and operations and support costs, ¶ 7, lines 15-17)

As per claim 6, the combination of Abrahams and Beverina and Examiner's Official Notice teaches the claimed invention as mentioned in claim 4, above. Abrahams further teaches the method further comprising the severity of consequence table to select the cost impact sub-categories and specify their dollar amounts (Table 2, p. 4 shows the severity of consequence table which includes cost impact sub-categories and dollar ranges.)

As per claim 12, the combination of Abrahams and Beverina teaches the claimed invention as mentioned in claim 11, above. However, the Abrahams and Beverina combination fails to explicitly teach the method wherein a risk review board (RRB) report is generated by submitting minutes for a RRB meeting by entering information for each risk covered during a RRB meeting and entering the date of the RRB meeting; and submitting the minutes to generate the RRB report including Number, Title, Actionee, Rf, Risk Level and Comments for each risk. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of meetings to generate and submit minutes. Examiner further takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of recording minutes to record topics discussed as well as the date of the meeting. Beverina, teaches that clauses of a report can include "Data values in the database and results from simple queries of the database that return text or simple data values" (¶ 429-432). These results would include information such as Risk Factors, Risk Level and Comments. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the system of Abrahams with the reporting features of Beverina in view of Examiner's Official Notice. Motivation to combine is increased communication within a risk management setting.

As per claim 15, Abrahams teaches s method of managing risk related to a successful completion of a development project, comprising:

tailoring a probability of occurrence (Pf) table having a number of risk categories to have

a fewer number of said risk categories that are relevant to the development project, each said

category having table entries that include standardized qualitative probability definitions; (via

Table 1, page 4)

identifying a plurality of risks relating to the successful completion of the development

project; (Fig. 1B displays a plurality of risks)

assigning a risk factor (Rf) to each risk by selecting the table entry Pf for the risk

category in the Pf table that most closely describes the risk, selecting the table entries Cf for the

cost impact and schedule impact categories in the Cf table, computing a function of Pf and Cf.

and keeping the highest risk factor Rf (Fig. 1C shows the for a given risk the Residual likelihood

[risk factor], the cost impact [inherent risk impact cost], schedule impact [residual risk impact

cost], and a function of Pf and Cf, the highest risk factor [inherent risk rating], these factors are

calculated using Tables 1 and 2 on p. 4)

having a cost impact category with table entries specifying multiple sub-categories of

cost impacts in actual dollars for the development project (via Table 2, that shows an example of

different risk consequences, Table 2, p. 4)

However, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose tailoring a severity of consequence (Cf)

table having a schedule impact category with table entries specifying an amount in days, weeks

or months, and prioritizing the risks based on the assigned risk factors Rf. Beverina, in the same

field of endeavor [risk management systems], teaches "Clicking on a column heading will sort

and group the table based on that column" (Fig. 16, where the Probability of attack is the risk

factor). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine

the method of Abrahams with the organization tools of Beverina. Motivation to combine is a
risk management method with better risk organization tools.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of project
management to measure negative impacts upon projects like delays in units of time such as days,
weeks, or months. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to
combine the system of Abrahams with the sorting of Beverina in view of Examiner's Official
Notice. Motivation to combine is to have an additional quantifiable way to measure
consequences of a particular outcome as well as an easy way to sort the results.

As per claim 16, Abrahams teaches the method wherein said multiple sub-categories
include development cost (NRE), unit cost (DTC) and operations and support (O/S) categories.
(via "in one mode of use, the inherent risk impact cost is aggregated over the inherent cost of
each consequence of the risk" where consequences of each risk would inherently include
development cost, unit cost, and operations and support costs, ¶ 7, lines 15-17)

As per claim 17, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose the method wherein the risk factor
Rf is the product of Pf and Cf. However, Beverina in the same field of endeavor [risk
management systems] teaches "calculating a probability that an event will occur; calculating a
vulnerability to the event; and calculating a relative risk based on the probability and
vulnerability" (Claim 13) It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of
invention to combine the system of Abrahams with the calculations of Beverina. Motivation to
combine is to quantify the risk factors in such a fashion that they can be compared.

As per claim 18, Abrahams teaches the ability to tailor the Pf and Cf tables (via Table 1
and Table 2, p. 4) and that they are in the same database (Fig. 1C shows a template for an

identified risk, and control [mitigation] plans, said information must inherently be stored within a

database). However, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose that they are available via a web

browser and that a plurality of users have access. Beverina in the same field of endeavor [risk

management systems] teaches a plurality of users (Fig. 1), and a web browser (Fig. 3). It would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the risk

management system taught by Abrahams with the risk management system features of Beverina.

Motivation for the combination is a system with easier access to more users.

5.   Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrahams

(2005/0086090) and Beverina (2001/0027389) in view of Heinrich (6,895,383).

        As per claim 19, Abrahams teaches a web-based risk management system for managing

risk related to a successful completion of a development project, comprising:

        a server comprising a shared risk database that stores a probability of occurrence (Pf)

table (via Table 1, that shows an example of different risk probabilities, Table 1, p. 4) and a

severity of consequence (Cf) table (via Table 2, that shows an example of different risk

consequences, Table 2, p. 4), risk identification information and risk mitigation information (Fig.

1C shows a template for an identified risk, and control [mitigation] plans, where said information

must inherently be stored within a database);

        However, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose a web-based risk management tool on the

server that provides standardized interfaces for searching, viewing and entering information to

and from the shared risk database via a web browser, an intranet, and a plurality of computer

workstations in communication with the server via the intranet, each said workstation provided

with a web browser to search the database using the standardized interfaces to identify risks, to

select entries from the Pf and Cf tables to calculate and prioritize a risk factor Rf for each risk,

and to search the database to identify existing risk mitigation plans for the prioritized risks.

Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems] teaches each said

work station provided with a web browser to search the database using the standardized

interfaces to identify risks (Fig. 3), to select entries from the Pf and Cf tables [via the THREATS

and VULNERABILITY hyperlinks in the drawing], to calculate and prioritize a risk factor Rf for

each risk (where the calculation is accomplished by "calculating a probability that an event will

occur; calculating a vulnerability to the event; and calculating a relative risk based on the

probability and vulnerability", Claim 13, and prioritizing a risk factor is done by "clicking on a

column heading will sort and group the table based on that column", Fig. 16). It would have

been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the system taught by

Abrahams with the browser abilities of Beverina. Motivation to combine is easier access to the

system.

However, Abrahams and Beverina both fail to disclose an intranet and a plurality of

workstations in communication with the server via the intranet. Heinrich, in the same field of

endeavor [risk management] teaches "a system containing a user computer, a network, and a

security computer", (Col. 15, lines 46-47) and that the network "may also represent a corporate

extranet or intranet" (Col. 15, lines 53-55). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art

at the time of invention to combine the combination of Abrahams and Beverina with the network

of Heinrich. Motivation for the combination is to create a risk management system with easy

system interaction and easy user communication.

As per claim 20, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose the method wherein the web browser has an interface that includes a menu bar with pull-down menu items and menu sub-items for viewing the current program, conducting the enterprise search and conducting the mitigation search and hyperlinks to the Pf and Cf tables. However, Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems] teaches a web browser (Fig. 3), with pull-down menu items [viewable in the drawing] and menu sub-items for viewing the current program [viewable in the drawing], conducting the enterprise search [via the search box] and conducting the mitigation search [via the search box] and hyperlinks to the Pf and Cf tables [via the THREATS and VULNERABILITY hyperlinks in the drawing]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the risk management system taught by Abrahams with the web based feature of Beverina. Motivation for the combination is a system with more features that should produce better risk management analysis and techniques as well as easier navigation of information.

6.   Claims 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrahams (2005/0086090), Beverina (2001/0027389), and Heinrich (6,895,383) in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

As per claim 21, the combination of Abrahams, Beverina and Heinrich teaches the claimed invention as mentioned in claim 19, above. Abrahams further teaches the system wherein the PF table has a plurality of risk categories, each said category having table entries that include standardized qualitative probability definitions (via Table 1, that shows an example of different risk probabilities, Table 1, p. 4) and the Cf table having a cost impact category with table entries for specifying multiple sub-categories of cost impacts in actual dollars for the

development project, (via Table 2, that shows an example of different sub-categories, Table 2, p.

4) and tailoring the Pf table to have few categories that are relevant to the current project (¶ 6,

lines 7-8 teach that a user can select inherent values of likelihood and consequence for a risk

[this data coming from Table 1 on p. 4]).

However, the Abrahams, Beverina and Heinrich combination fails to teach a schedule impact

category with table entries for specifying a schedule impact amount in days, weeks or months

and a web browser providing administrative access.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of project

management to measure negative impacts upon projects like delays in units of time such as days,

weeks, or months. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

combine the table taught by Abrahams and Heinrich with Examiner's Official Notice.

Motivation to combine is to have an additional quantifiable way to measure consequences of a

particular outcome.

Beverina, further teaches a web browser (Fig. 3), and administrative access (via Fig. 1

where the Senior Commander is the administrative access). It would have been obvious to one

skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the system of Abrahams, Beverina, and

Heinrich in view of Examiner's Official Notice with the additional features of Beverina.

Motivation to combine is to create a risk management system with more detailed information and

easier access.

As per claim 22, the Abrahams and Heinrich combination fails to explicitly disclose the

system wherein the workstation via the web browser submits an enterprise search that includes a

combination of at least two parameters including current or historic, risk factor, vendor,

component, functional area, category, key word in risk title, key word in risk description, IPT,

actionee, actionee/team lead/submitter or risk number and the server returns via the web browser

an enterprise search results list including for at least one risk a combination of risk number,

program, risk title, a current risk factor and its risk mitigation plan.. However, Beverina, in the

same field of endeavor [risk management systems], teaches searches "by categories such as

threat type, risk, score and others". Examiner construes risk to be the current risk factor, and

threat type to be the category. Beverina further teaches that users can "search and browse the

data from the individual VAT 200 sessions by categories such as threat type, risk, score and

others." (¶ 363) Figure 50 shows a calendar within that VAT 200 for entry of start and

completion dates. A user therefore, would be able to do a mitigation search including the

parameters of start date and complete date. Finally, Beverina teaches a web browser enterprise

search (Fig. 3 via the search option). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the

time of invention to combine the system of Abrahams and Heinrich with the tools of Beverina.

Motivation to combine is creation of a risk management system with easier access to information

and ease of modification.

As per claim 23, the Abrahams and Heinrich combination fails to explicitly disclose the

system wherein the workstation via the web browser submits a mitigation search that includes a

combination of at least two parameters including a risk description, risk status, start date, original

planned complete date, planned complete date and complete date and the server returns existing

mitigation plans that satisfy the search parameters. However, Beverina, in the same field of

endeavor [risk management systems], teaches that users can "search and browse the data from

the individual VAT 200 sessions by categories such as threat type, risk, score and others." (¶

363) Figure 50 shows a calendar within that VAT 200 for entry of start and completion dates. A user therefore, would be able to do a mitigation search including the parameters of start date and complete date. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the risk management system taught by Abrahams and Heinrich with the risk management system features of Beverina. Motivation for the combination is a system with more features that should produce better risk management analysis and techniques.

As per claim 24, the Abrahams and Heinrich combination fails to explicitly disclose the system wherein the workstations automatically submit identified risks, risk factors and mitigation plans to the shared database, said server automatically generating risk reports including identified risks, prioritized risk factors and mitigation plans for the current project. However, Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems], teaches that users can "create, edit and delete report formats to create new and customized reports to meet future needs" (¶ 374, lines 6-7). A user would be enabled to create risk reports including the identified risk, prioritizeed risk factors, and mitigation plans. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the risk management system taught by Abrahams and Heinrich with the risk management reporting feature of Beverina. Motivation for the combination is a system with more features that should produce better risk management analysis and techniques as well as easier sharing of information.

As per claim 25, Abrahams teaches a web-based risk management system for managing risk related to a successful completion of a development project, comprising: a server comprising a shared risk database that stores a probability of occurrence (Pf) (via Table 1, that shows an example of different risk probabilities, Table 1, p. 4) table having a number of risk categories

and a severity of consequence (Cf) having a cost impact category with table entries specifying

multiple sub-categories of cost impacts in actual dollars for the development project, (via Table

2, that shows an example of different sub-categories, Table 2, p. 4), risk identification

information and risk mitigation information (Fig. 1C shows a template for an identified risk, and

control [mitigation] plans);

      However, Abrahams fails to explicitly disclose a Cf table having a schedule impact

category with table entries specifying an amount in days, weeks, or moths;

      a web-based risk management tool on the server that provides standardized interfaces

having a menu bar with menu items and menu sub-items for searching, viewing and entering

information to and from the shared risk data and hyperlinks to the Pf and Cf tables base via a

web browser;

      an intranet;

      a computer workstation in communication with the server via the intranet, said

workstation provided with a web browser for tailoring the Pf table to have a fewer number of

said risk categories and the Cf table to specify the dollar amounts for the cost impact sub-

categories and the days, weeks or months for the schedule impact;

      a plurality of computer workstations in communication with the server via the intranet,

each said workstation provided with a web browser to search the database to identify risks, to

select entries from the tailored Pf and Cf tables to calculate and prioritize a risk factor Rf for

each risk, to search the database to identify risk mitigation information for the prioritized risks

and to track and report on the status of identified risks.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of project

management to measure negative impacts upon projects like delays in units of time such as days,

weeks, or months. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

combine the table taught by Abrahams with Examiner's Official Notice. Motivation to combine

is to have an additional quantifiable way to measure consequences of a particular outcome.

Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems] teaches each said

work station provided with a web browser to search the database using the standardized

interfaces to identify risks (Fig. 3), to select entries from the Pf and Cf tables [via the THREATS

and VULNERABILITY hyperlinks in the drawing], to calculate and prioritize a risk factor Rf for

each risk (where the calculation is accomplished by "calculating a probability that an event will

occur; calculating a vulnerability to the event; and calculating a relative risk based on the

probability and vulnerability", Claim 13, and prioritizing a risk factor is done by "clicking on a

column heading will sort and group the table based on that column", Fig. 16) Beverina, further

teaches that users can "create, edit and delete report formats to create new and customized

reports to meet future needs" (¶ 374, lines 6-7). A user would be enabled to create risk reports

including the identified risk, prioritized risk factors, and mitigation plans. It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the system taught by

Abrahams in view of Examiner's Official Notice with the features of Beverina. Motivation to

combine is an easier to understand risk management system

However, Abrahams, Beverina, and Examiner's Official Notice all fail to disclose an

intranet and a plurality of workstations in communication with the server via the intranet.

Heinrich, in the same field of endeavor [risk management] teaches "a system containing a user

computer, a network, and a security computer", (Col. 15, lines 46-47) and that the network "may

also represent a corporate extranet or intranet" (Col. 15, lines 53-55). It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the combination of

Abrahams in view of Examiner's Official Notice and Beverina with Heinrich. Motivation for the

combination is to create a risk management system with easy system interaction and easy user

communication.

As per claim 26, Abrahams teaches the method wherein said multiple sub-categories

include development cost (NRE), unit cost (DTC) and operations and support (O/S) categories.

(via "in one mode of use, the inherent risk impact cost is aggregated over the inherent cost of

each consequence of the risk" where consequences of each risk would inherently include

development cost, unit cost, and operations and support costs, ¶ 7, lines 15-17)

As per claim 27, the combination of Abrahams in view of Examiner's Official Notice and

Heinrich fails to explicitly disclose the system wherein the workstation via the web browser

submits an enterprise search that includes a combination of at least two parameters including

current or historic, risk factor, vendor, component, functional area, category, key word in risk

title, key word in risk description, IPT, actionee, actionee/team lead/submitter or risk number and

the server returns via the web browser an enterprise search results list including for at least one

risk a combination of risk number, program, risk title, a current risk factor and its risk mitigation

plan.. However, Beverina, in the same field of endeavor [risk management systems], teaches

searches "by categories such as threat type, risk, score and others". Examiner construes risk to

be the current risk factor, and threat type to be the category. Beverina further teaches that users

can "search and browse the data from the individual VAT 200 sessions by categories such as

threat type, risk, score and others." (¶ 363) Figure 50 shows a calendar within that VAT 200 for

entry of start and completion dates. A user therefore, would be able to do a mitigation search

including the parameters of start date and complete date. Finally, Beverina teaches a web

browser enterprise search (Fig. 3 via the search option). It would have been obvious to one

skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the combination of Abrahams in view of

Examiner's Official Notice and Heinrich with the tools of Beverina. Motivation to combine is

creation of a risk management system with easier access to information and ease of modification.

      As per claim 28, the combination of Abrahams, Beverina, Examiner's Official Notice and

Heinrich fails to explicitly disclose the system wherein the workstation via the web browser

submits a mitigation search that includes a combination of at least two parameters including a

risk description, risk status, start date, original planned complete date, planned complete date and

complete date and the server returns existing mitigation plans that satisfy the search parameters.

However, Beverina, further teaches that users can "search and browse the data from the

individual VAT 200 sessions by categories such as threat type, risk, score and others." (¶ 363)

Figure 50 shows a calendar within that VAT 200 for entry of start and completion dates. A user

therefore, would be able to do a mitigation search including the parameters of start date and

complete date. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

combine the risk management system taught by the combination of Abrahams in view of

Examiner's Official Notice and Heinrich with the risk management system features of Beverina.

Motivation for the combination is a system with more features that should produce better risk

management analysis and techniques.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL P. LUX whose telephone number is (571)270-5104. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynda Jasmin can be reached on 571-270-3033. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

mpl

/Lynda Jasmin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4127